SUBJECT No. 103.

Grant of loans to Inamdars on the hypothecation of their Jodi villages.

Mr. Dodda Venkatarama Reddi, Chintamani Taluk.
Mr. Dasappa.

Summary of discussion.—The rules for the grant of loans to Inamdars on the hypothecation of their Jodi and Kayamgutta villages and for the recovery of the same along with the Jodi amount, have since been cancelled. Pray that these rules may be brought into force again, as otherwise the Jodidars have to borrow money at high rates of interest from private usurers and by being unable to repay the loan, are often obliged to alienate their inams, thus frustrating the object for which the inams were originally granted.

Reply of Government.—This request has been repeatedly declined by Government and cannot be reopened.

SUBJECT No. 104.

Exemption of Brahmadaya from the levy of khalsat.

Messrs. Sondekoppada Dasappa and Subbanna, Bangalore District Board.

Summary of discussion.—In response to the repeated prayers from the people to exempt Devadayas and Brahmadayas from the levy of khalsat, the Devadayas were exempted from this levy in the time of the late Dewan Sir K. Sheshadri Iyer. The same concession may be extended to the Brahmadaya Inams also which are grants to poor Brahmins for praying for the welfare of our Maharaja.

Reply of Government.—Government have repeatedly declined to do this and cannot reconsider the matter.

SUBJECT No. 105.

Repayment of the costs incurred by the non-Brahmin holders of Brahmadaya Inams in case they are restored to the original Brahmin holders.

Mr. Agarada Rama Reddi, Bangalore Taluk.

Summary of discussion.—There is a rumour that the Brahmadaya lands in the enjoyment of non-Brahmin holders are to be restored to the Brahmin Inamdars. In case this is done, the cost incurred by the enjoyers may be returned to them.

Reply of Government.—Government have no such scheme under consideration.

SUBJECT No. 106.

Discontinuance of the issue of "stay orders" in 2nd appeals and grant of Court costs in such appeals.

Mr. Lakshminaranappa, Heggaddevankote Taluk.

Summary of discussion.—In 2nd appeals in Revenue cases orders are generally passed to hold in abeyance the order of the lower Court, pending the disposal of the 2nd appeal on the mere application of parties. This will cause parties much hardship. It is therefore solicited that such order should not be issued on the application of the applicant in 2nd appeals and that costs also should be granted in such appeals. This will avoid the increase of appeals and delay in their disposal.

Reply of Government.—The appellate authorities exercise their discretion in such cases.

SUBJECT No. 107.

Abolition of royalty for mud removed from the bed of tanks and for rocks removed from jungles for private use.

Messrs. Shroff Venkataramanaiya, Mohadeen Sab, Channapatna Taluk, and D. S. Gopalachar, Devanhalli Taluk.
Mr. Gopalachar, Devanhalli.

Summary of discussion.—The removal of silt from the beds of tanks goes towards the improvement of the tanks. While the removal of the same for the purposes of manure and house-building by raiyats is exempted from payment of royalty, the removal of it for brick making is not so exempted. So also the removal of stones from forests. These may also be kindly exempted from the payment of royalty.